DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 092 UD 022 190

AUTHOR Gross, Thomas; And Others
TITLE Seven School-Based Planning Projects in One Hundred and Seventy-Five New York City Elementary and Secondary Public Schools: A Comparative Analysis.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 64p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Accountability; Change Agents; *Change Strategies; Community Involvement; Compensatory Education; Cooperative Planning; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Management by Objectives; *Organizational Development; Political Influences; *Program Effectiveness; School Business Relationship; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *New York City Board of Education; *School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This report describes and assesses seven school-based planning projects to raise student achievement levels in the New York City Public Schools. Based on the principles of organizational development, the projects are: 1) the Renewal Program, a planning partnership between several high schools and the Economic Development Council, a nonprofit business organization providing private resource assistance to the public sector; 2) the Management By Objectives System which emphasizes data-based planning and accountability; 3) the School Improvement Project which bases improvement efforts on a given set of criteria of effective schools; 4) the Local School Development Project which emphasizes collaborative planning among participating schools; 5) the Comprehensive Planning Unit, a group that helps schools maximize the use of resources and coordinate funded programs to reduce redundant or fragmented instruction; 6) Targeted Schools, which focuses on improving high schools with low achievement levels and high dropout rates; and 7) Schoolwide Projects which, under legal authorization, provides Title I compensatory education funds to all students (rather than a restricted number) in schools with large proportions of educationally deprived children. The report suggests that the programs lead to improved pupil achievement and attendance, describes the requirements for creating effective schools, and discusses other issues related to school-based planning. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217092

SEVEN SCHOOL-BASED PLANNING PROJECTS IN ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY FIVE NYC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Comparative Analysis

By
Thomas Gross

Edited by
Anna Elman

Contributions
Richard Borell
Askia Davis
Perry Davis
Ira Gelernter
Lynn Gray
Richard Guttenberg
Larry Litoff
Ann Masters
Dennis McCarthy
Pat Montesano
Rosalyn Oratz
Aida Price
Ernie Turner

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas Gross

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

For Presentation at the
Annual Meeting of The American Research Association
New York City
March 1982

UD 022 190

The New York City Public School System is demonstrating a wide-spread commitment to school-based planning* techniques in an effort to raise achievement levels of its students. One hundred and seventy schools are currently participating in one or more of seven such projects. The resources supporting these projects are considerable, particularly in terms of technical assistance. Evidence is accumulating that the achievement levels are improving as a consequence of participating schools properly employing planning activities with their own staffs and in some cases, community and student constituencies. This development is significant in the history of school-based planning.

In their synthesis of the field, Organization Development in Schools, The State of the Art, Fullan, Miles and Taylor (1981) state: "Student benefits ... cannot be ignored as a criterion

---

*School-based planning approximates in meaning a term commonly found in behavioral sciences literature, "organization development", also known as "OD". We have chosen to use the term "school-based planning" to emphasize the most salient common denominator of the seven NYC projects. Namely, the process of planning for the improvement of the school is carried out within the school. Organization development denotes more than that.

Fullan, Miles and Taylor (1981) define OD in schools as including: "... planning change; long range; organizational improvement in problem solving, conflict resolution; a focus on human processes and technostructural factors in order to improve both task accomplishment and the quality of life of individuals; assistance of change agent or catalyst; use of behavioral science techniques to gather valid data in a reflexive, self-analytic fashion." "It remains tacitly clear in most ... other definitions that OD is not a technocratic, expert-advice-giving model of planned change, but one in which organization members themselves participate directly in organizational study, diagnosis and change."

This definition of OD will be helpful to our understanding of the seven NYC school-based planning projects through its richness even though none of the projects explicitly manifests all of the OD characteristics.

of OD's (organization development's) success in schools. So far, impact of this sort has been less frequently reported than impact on adults." This paper will address this limitation and will report on "impact of this sort" on the students of NYC public schools as a consequence of effective school-based planning.

Current developments in the seven NYC school-based planning projects may represent a new evolutionary stage in the history of OD in schools through their explicit attention to student achievement. OD in schools traditionally has emphasized the improvement of organizational processes in the belief that students would receive a better education as a consequence. Yet, until now, OD projects in schools have not included the improvement of student learning as an explicit objective. (Fullan, Miles and Taylor, 1981).

The typical OD programs in schools were designed so that the plans developed in and for a particular school were entirely the choice of the internal planning committee and the principal. (Schmuck, et.al, 1977; Fullan, Miles, Taylor, 1981; Gross and Bassin, 1978) If they did not define improvement of achievement as an objective then the plan for the school would not contain that objective. For example, the NYC Renewal Program, which will be reported on in greater detail in this paper rarely had the objective for improving student achievement in the plans among its thirty participating schools.

This tentativeness was a function of a variety of factors. The mid-seventies was still a period in which school people and practitioners of OD in schools were uncertain that they could

succeed in improving student achievement. The major studies of the impact of schooling on student achievement by Coleman and Jencks during the sixties and early seventies concluded that student achievement was more a function of family background, upbringing and social class than a function of schooling practices. At the time those studies were conducted, they contributed to and became a part of prevailing societal attitudes that schools did not make a difference, that schools were absorbing too much tax money and that schools were getting worse. The last belief became a self-fulfilling prophecy in many cases as budgets for education were cut, curricula dismantled and public confidence in schools diminished.

The climate in the New York City educational community is quite different today. The current Chancellor, Frank Macchiarola, has made his educational philosophy clear: "All children can learn and our schools can help them learn better and faster. We will improve our schools and the students' achievement levels will improve." Within this philosophy, the seven school-based planning projects have flourished.

Other elements in the climate of the NYC Public School System are conducive to these projects. Constituenices no longer feel as disenfranchised as they did in the sixties. Decentralization did occur in the late sixties and the communities now have considerable control over the education

of their students. The school system has an active, effective policy on integration and conflicts over integration occur only in isolated situations. The financial crisis in NYC in the mid-seventies brought constituencies closer out of necessity to work together. For example, the teacher union, the UFT, played a significant role in financially assisting the city with the ample resources of its pension fund in 1975 and later.

A final crucial element in the positive climate of the school system for school-based planning is the new emphasis on management planning and accountability systems. Just as the Mayor has introduced management reforms in city government since the beginning of his first term in 1978, the Chancellor has done the same with the school system since the beginning of his first term, also in 1978. School-based planning is simply a variation of management planning and accountability systems.

Given the focus in the NYC Public School System on improving achievement for all students, we will explore how the seven school-based planning projects attempt to accomplish this objective and in some cases, are succeeding. They all apply findings of both educational and behavioral science research. The educational research which is employed, focuses on the characteristics of effective schools and instructional programs in which inner-city students learn well. The behavioral science research, which is employed, focuses on the methods for effectively improving schools from within, i.e. OD.

The Seven NYC School-Based Planning Projects--Sources of Data

The projects reported on in this analysis are summarized in the following table in terms of the number of schools currently participating and the initial date of school participation in the project.

Project	Number of schools currently participating	Initial Date of Participation
High School Renewal Program	12 (also in MBO)	1969
High School Management by Objectives (MBO)	112 (all high schools in NYC)	1978
School Improvement Project	16 elementary schools	1979
Local School Development Project	35 elementary and junior high schools	1979
Targeted High Schools Project	13 (also in MBO)	1980
Comprehensive Planning Unit	9 elementary schools	1980
School-wide Projects	6 elementary schools	1980

The sources of data used in this analysis include third party evaluation data for four of the projects and reports from administrators of the projects for all of the projects.

The High School Renewal Program was first reported on in a paper presented to AERA based on a third party evaluation (Gross and Bassin, 1978). The update to that paper was contributed for this analysis by Mr. Ira Gelernter, currently one of the consultants to Renewal schools and MBO schools and a staff member of the office of the High School Superintendent of Queens, Mr. Aaron Maloff.

The High School Management By Objectives Program is reported on by Dr. Thomas Gross who was the second Administrator of the project and participated in its implementation during 1978-79, and Mr. Larry Litoff, who was the third Administrator of the project and participated in its implementation from 1978 to present. Mr. Litoff also is on the staff of Mr. Martin Ilivicky, High School Superintendent, Brooklyn.

The School Improvement Project is reported on by Dr. Richard Guttenberg, Director, Office of Educational Evaluation, NYC Board of Education; Dr. Dennis McCarthy, Principal Documentor for the project, Documentation Unit of the Office of Educational Evaluation and Mrs. Rosalyn Oratz, Administrator of the project.

The Local School Development Project is reported on by Dr. Lynn Gray, Director of Education Programs, NYC Urban Coalition and Chief Administrator of the project; Mr. Ernie Turner, Co-Director of the project; Mr. Askia Davis, Co-Director of the project; Dr. Richard Guttenberg; Dr. Dennis McCarthy, Principal Documentor of this project, and Mr. Pat Monteseno of the Urban Coalition.

The Comprehensive Planning Unit is reported on by Ms. Aida Price, Administrator of the project; Dr. Perry Davis, Director, Office of Funded Programs in which the project is institutionally located and Dr. Richard Guttenberg, whose office conducted a formative evaluation of the project as part of the Title IV-C Resource Allocation Program which funds the project.

The School-wide Projects is reported on by Dr. Richard Borell, Office of Funded Programs and Dr. Perry Davis, whose office administers the project.

All projects were commented on analytically by Ms. Ann Masters, assistant to Deputy Chancellor Richard Halverson, NYC Board of Education.

The collaboration of all projects for the development of this analysis was authorized by Dr. Thomas Minter, Deputy Chancellor for Instruction, NYC Board of Education.

THE SEVEN NYC SCHOOL-BASED PLANNING PROJECTS--A BRIEF ASSESSMENT

The Renewal Program

Chronologically, the first of the school-based planning projects to be reported on here is the Renewal Program. In 1969, the Economic Development Council of NYC, a non-profit business organization which provided management consulting services to the public sector, began a pilot project in two public high schools to explore how the private sector might assist the school system. A school-based planning approach was developed in 1974. The project evolved into the Renewal Program operating in eight schools and employing the strategies of organization development. In 1978, the program peaked in terms of membership and thirty high schools participated, assisted by seven OD consultants. Today, in 1982, twelve schools actively are engaged in Renewal planning and implementation activities, with occasional support from three OD consultants.

The major characteristics of the Renewal Program include voluntary participation in a Renewal Committee by teachers, administrators and other staff guided by a coordinator who is on the school staff and supported by an external OD consultant under the dual employ of the Economic Development Council and the school system. The consultant teaches the committee how to plan, run meetings and monitor implementation of programs which have been approved by the principal. The plans may be in any area the

committee chooses, with the approval of the principal. The consultants employ an explicit planning model which specifies the roles of all participants. The steps of the model include entry, diagnosis, planning, implementation, evaluation and institutionalization.

In an analysis of the program, Gross and Bassin (1978) draw upon a third party evaluation and report mostly qualitative findings. "Over the thirty schools, the significance of change varies from very substantial to nothing at all. However, both very great and nothing are extreme. In most schools there are changes that do affect hundreds of students. For the most part, the schools remain basically the same, with improvements interspersed throughout." (p. 87)

The third party evaluation team examined a sample of twelve schools participating in the program and found that three had institutionalized the Renewal planning model. That was during a period when consultants were visiting participating schools as frequently as once or twice a week. The twelve schools of the original thirty which are still operating with committees using the Renewal planning model give further confirmation that the rate of institutionalization is seen to be about one third.

Compared with the other school-based planning projects which came later in NYC, the Renewal Program focused more on the area of the processes of planning, change and implementation and less on the content of educational improvement. It left instructional goals to the school people themselves to determine. The successor projects have presented content goals to participating schools from the outset.

The factors for success in Renewal, as presented by Gross and Bassin (1978) included a variety of OD processes and roles. The principal was found to be the key to the implementation of plans. Without the managerial support and direction of the principal, plans would languish and not become programmatic realities. The internal coordinator was found to be the key to the development of plans and the involvement of various constituencies within the school. The internal coordinator worked closely with the principal in schools with effective Renewal projects. The internal coordinator was also instrumental to the process of implementation through follow-up support and attention in order to assure that the implementors needs for resources, space and recognition were met by the principal. The effective external consultant worked closely with the internal coordinator and the principal to guide them and the committee through the steps of the Renewal planning model.

MBO (Management By Objectives) In The High Schools

During the school year 1978-79 the Executive Director of the High School Division of New York City requested assistance from the Renewal Consultant Group consisting of seven consultants, to implement a Management By Objectives System in all one hundred and twelve high schools under his jurisdiction. The Executive Director reports directly to the Chancellor and was responding to the Chancellor's policy of implementing management reporting and accountability systems in the central offices and divisions of the school system.

While no third party evaluation of the MBO system has been conducted, certain facts are notable in themselves. The implementation of the MBO system is now mid-way through its third complete year. For four consecutive years each principal has been receiving a data profile of his or her school, including pupil achievement, attendance and disciplinary data, as well as staff attendance data. The longitudinal profiles are the basis for required plans by each principal and must specify activities, calendars for implementation and individuals reponsible for implementation. These plans must be consistant with the overall goals for the high schols as set annually by the Executive Director. The site visits by the Executive Director and the Superintendents are focused on the data profiles and the plans.

The principals are evaluated annually by the superintendents on their progress toward implementing plans. The plans must address the needs of the school as evidenced by the data profiles. For three consecutive years every principal has written a plan and every plan has been reviewed in detail by the Superintendent. The principals are assisted in the development of their plans by the MBO consultants. There are five Superintendents and at this time there are four full time consultants working on MBO. Three of these consultants formerly were Renewal consultants and they are the ones who still provide occasional support to the remaining Renewal schools.

One example of how this process focuses on policy priorities concerns the problem of high school dropouts. The High School Division, under the direction of Deputy Chancellor Halverson and Chancellor Macchiarola, published a report in 1979 which presented the dropout rate for high schools as an average of 45% of all students who enter high school. The High School Division established a policy of Dropout Prevention. Each high school's MBO plans must address this issue. The Dropout Prevention Policy is a major element in the current philosophy guiding the school system. It is a direct reflection of the Chancellor's position that schools must serve all children and all children can learn.

As a school-based planning project, MBO in the High Schools calls for involvement of school constituencies in a variety of ways. The principal is instructed to develop his or her plan in collaboration with the assistant principals, who can number as many as eight or ten in a large high school. The assistant principals, in turn, are instructed to develop plans with and

for their own areas of jurisdiction, either academic departments, guidance, or administration. Finally, last year the High School Division began to require written daily lesson plans from all teachers. Plans on all levels are specified in terms of "objectives" that is, clear, behaviorally specific activities. Compliance with the MBO system on all levels is reported by Superintendents to be extremely high. The Superintendents regularly visit each school under their jurisdiction and closely monitor the MBO system.

The School Improvement Project

The School Improvement Project shares certain characteristics with earlier OD projects in schools. It, too, employs constituency based planning committees within the building; relies on the principal as the leader of change; and utilizes the services of external process consultants to teach the school people the planning process.

There are significant differences as well. "SIP", as participants call the project, begins with a different premise than did earlier OD projects. SIP strives to help schools improve themselves in five areas found by Edmonds (1979) to characterize effective urban schools in which children from low socio-economic groups learn on a par with national norms. Consequently, SIP differs from earlier OD projects by taking a normative position on what an effective school should be.

The five factors identified by Edmonds include the following: the administrative style of the principal as an effective, participative manager and instructional leader; an emphasis on basic skills throughout the curricula; school climate conducive to learning (i.e. not too restrictive nor permissive); ongoing systematic assessment of pupil progress; and positive teacher expectations of all students' ability to learn. These five factors become the basis for the needs assessment and the plan for school improvement.

Another difference between SIP and earlier OD projects is that in SIP, the needs assessment is conducted by the liaison (i.e. consultant) assigned to the school, whereas in earlier OD projects the needs assessment was developed by the planning committee. The SIP needs assessment is more comprehensive since almost every staff member is interviewed, as are selected parents. In addition, achievement and attendance data going back seven years are analyzed. All of the data are analyzed within the framework of Edmonds' five factors.

The etiology of the School Improvement Project in 1979 also relates to Edmond's five factors. Dr. Ronald Edmonds was invited by Chancellor Macchiarola to serve as his senior instructional executive in the school system in 1978 because of his research and philosophy on effective urban schools. Chancellor Macchiarola adopted his conclusions that all children can learn and schools, if properly run, can teach all children according to their potential. The School Improvement Project was conceptualized by Dr. Edmonds to make research findings on the effectiveness of schools operational.

Research demonstrated characteristics of effective schools, the project would attempt to create such effective schools out of schools in need of improvement. The project was clear on its goals and would borrow from organization development to find the means.

A School Liaison Team of two consultant/liaisons is assigned to two or three schools to actively work with the schools through the needs assessment, committee formation and plan development phases of the program. Either one or both of the liaisons spend two to three days per week in each school depending upon the particular needs of the school at different points in time. After the plan is completed, the liaison team acts in a supportive capacity. The team assists the school in implementing the activities outlined in the plan, closely monitoring the implementation process. The team also facilitates the delivery of resources and services available through the project, central school administration and district offices. The liaisons function differently from OD consultants in yet another way. In addition to being process consultants they also function as content consultants who advise on instructional programs and carry out teacher training in curricula areas.

SIP has two generations of participating schools. Each school is guided through seven stages of the SIP planning model. The newest generation, numbering nine public elementary schools, carried out the first five phases of the SIP planning model during 1980-81: school selection and project introduction; school needs assessment; planning committee formation; development of the improvement plan and plan review. The older generation

of participating schools, numbering seven, worked on the sixth and seventh phases of the program: implementation of the improvement plan and plan evaluation and revision.

SIP staff in 1980-81 consisted of two project administrators, eleven school liaisons and two office staff. In addition, three professional researchers comprise a Documentation Unit* which is recording the development and implementation of SIP.

The Documentation Unit has completed assessments for each of the first two years of operation of SIP. It reports that the SIP process of planning and committee formation is functioning well in all participating schools. Evidence is also accumulating that significant plans for projects are being implemented in most schools. The most notable example is the basic skills areas, one of Edmonds' five factors. All of the first generation participant schools have planned for and implemented reading programs with continuous curricula, grades 1 through 6. Previously, the reading curricula in these schools were fragmented from one grade to another so that the children were not taught a logically developmental sequence of learning objectives. Through SIP, this problem has been rectified. The SIP professionals assisted the schools in selecting a continuous reading curriculum, trained the teachers in its use, and developed management tools with principals to monitor the implementation of the reading program and the progress of all students within the program.

The following table represents reading results for SIP schools during their participation in the program.

---

*The Documentation Unit is also documenting the activities of the Local School Development Project which is described below.

The School Improvement Project:
Change in Percent of Pupils Reading At or Above Grade Level,
Spring, 1980 to Spring, 1981*

School (District)	Pupils Reading At or Above Grade Level Spring, 1980	Spring, 1981	Change, 1980 to 1981
Second Year Schools			
P.S. 92 (5)	30.2%	36.6%	+ 6.4%
P.S. 98 (6)**	19.5	24.5	+ 5.0
P.S.134 (12)	23.2	32.6	+ 9.3
P.S. 27 (15)	26.9	33.3	+ 6.4
P.S.155 (23)**	28.7	40.5	+11.8
P.S.203 (26)	75.1	84.5	+ 9.4
P.S. 35 (29)	44.0	46.4	+ 2.4
		Average gain =	+ 7.2
First Year Schools			
P.S.113 (3)	30.3%	31.1%	+ 0.8%
P.S.133 (5)	34.6	30.0	- 4.6
P.S. 57 (12)**	21.7	30.5	+ 8.8
P.S. 56 (13)	38.7	42.0	+ 3.3
P.S.316 (17)	35.1	44.4	+ 9.3
P.S.216 (21)	64.8	70.6	+ 5.8
P.S.105 (27)	24.0	32.4	+ 8.4
P.S. 48 (28)	22.9	30.2	+ 7.3
P.S.384	24.3	26.7	+ 2.4
		Average gain =	+ 4.6
		Total Average Gain =	+ 5.8%

*Students of limited English proficiency who were excused from the test are included in the percentage of pupils reading below grade level.

**These districts had at least ten percent of their students excused from the test due to limited English proficiency.

A preliminary analysis of the change in reading scores for these schools by the Documentation Unit indicates that all but one school showed gains in percent of students reading at or above grade level between Spring 1980 and Spring 1981. The gains ranged from 0.8% to 11.8%. The seven schools which have participated in SIP for two years show an average gain of 7.2% between 1980 and 1981. The nine new schools had an average gain of 4.6%. The average gain for all 16 schools was 5.8%. The citywide average gain was 4.0%. Gains for the seven two year project schools between Spring, 1979 and Spring, 1980 average 8.4%; the citywide average gain in that year was 6.4%. The two year gain was 15.7% for SIP and 10.4% citywide.

The data imply a causal relationship between the implementation of SIP in a school as a planning process, the ensuing implementation of instructional programs and the increase in reading scores for its students. It is too early to definitely make the claim that there exists such a causal relationship. The Documentation Unit will be analyzing the data and the possibilities for such a causal inference carefully over the next several months. It is using Edmonds five factors as the framework for evaluation. At this time we may conclude that the likelihood is high that such a causal relationship exists.

A significant step has been taken in 1981-82 toward institutionalization of SIP. Three Community District Superintendents are funding full-time liaisons themselves. The Superintendents, in collaboration with the SIP staff, are developing a "district model", whereby the district is self-sufficient in supporting SIP in its schools.

The Local School Development Project

Thirty five elementary and junior high schools participate in the Local School Development Project and membership is growing. In common with the other school-based planning projects, each school has a planning committee which recommends projects to the principal for implementation. Yet the conception of Local School Development is less linear than that of the other projects in terms of a set sequence of activities which result in plans and program implementation in the building. The project is more politically and community oriented than the other projects, by building collaboration among constituencies and by developing a sense of community within participating schools. A context is created within which the rational, linear process of comprehensive planning occurs.

This approach may explain a paradoxical finding among Local School Development Schools. By the time the first plans for improvement were written at the end of school year 1980-81, some participating schools already began to demonstrate impressive gains in reading scores. That is, program implementation and improvement in achievement had already occurred before the formal plans were codified. The administrators of the Local School Development Project believe that improvement in achievment is due to factors in addition to the specific programs which were implemented. They report that the sense of community which has been developed in several participating schools has led to improved teacher expectations of student performance and more frequent and enthusiastic communication among staff members about school affairs. Causal inferences as to the relation of the Local

School Development Project to improved achievement must await more data and detailed analysis by the Documentation Unit which is documenting both this project and the School Improvement Project.

The host organization for the Local School Development Project is the Urban Coalition of New York City, a non-profit business, labor, community organization which organizes projects to improve the delivery of public sector services through coalitions of business, labor, government and community groups. It began the project by creating a city-wide council represented by a variety of constituencies, including management from the school system and the teacher labor union. Its basic premise was that if it could get collaboration from the upper echelons of these disparate groups, then it could create similar collaboration from the disparate groups within a school for the purpose of local school development. It succeeded in creating the city-wide council and in creating committees within the participating schools which represent the different constituencies.

An important element of the concept of collaboration among constituencies for the project has been to involve directly the Community District Superintendent whose schools are involved in the project. An important part of that direct involvement entails the agreement by the superintendent to allocate one of his/her staff members as a technical assistant to the schools and as a liaison to the Urban Coalition project staff. The Coalition contributes a counterpart who is the consultant to the district and helps organize and train planning committees. Each school also provides an internal coordinator who is the leader of the committee, part time, and who works closely with the principal.

In order for a school to participate in the Local School Development Project several parties must agree: the superintendent, the principal, the local chapter of the teacher's union and the parents' organization. From the beginning of the project, a constituency based coalition is formed in a school. The

The following table presents changes in percent of pupils reading at or above grade level in Local School Development Project schools, comparing Spring, 1980 with Spring, 1981.

The Local School Development Project:
Change in Percent of Pupils Reading At or Above Grade Level,
Spring, 1980 to Spring, 1981*

School (District)	Pupils Reading At or Above Grade Level Spring, 1980	Spring, 1981	Change, 1980 to 1981
P.S. 101 (4)*	34.1%	44.1%	+10.0%
P.S. 108 (4)*	28.2	37.8	+ 9.6
CLC 171 (4)	----	----	---
JHS 99 (4)*	27.0	39.3	+12.3
JHS 117 (4)	26.9	37.5	+10.6
P.S. 44 (12)*	33.5	46.5	+13.0
P.S. 61 (12)*	40.9	51.5	+10.6
P.S. 66 (12)*	20.8	27.0	+ 6.2
P.S. 211 (12)*	20.1	23.5	+ 3.4
P.S. 234 (12)*	51.6	39.8	-11.8
JHS 136 (12)	31.5	12.0	-19.5
I.S. 158 (12)*	21.2	41.8	+20.6
Alt School (12)	----	----	----
P.S. 9 (13)	46.2	49.2	+ 3.2
P.S. 20 (13)	52.7	59.7	+ 7.0
P.S. 46 (13)*	42.3	46.3	+ 4.0
P.S. 67 (13)	41.5	45.1	+ 3.6
P.S. 282 (13)*	35.2	31.0	- 4.2
P.S. 307 (13)	41.4	50.6	+ 9.2
JHS 265 (13)	34.0	42.4	+ 8.4
JHS 294 (13)	27.2	34.0	+ 6.9
P.S. 137 (23)	41.4	39.6	- 1.8
P.S. 178 (23)	31.8	32.9	+ 1.1
P.S. 284 (23)	22.3	26.4	+ 4.1
P.S. 327 (23)	46.9	50.7	+ 3.8
P.S. 332 (23)*	18.9	26.7	+ 7.8
I.S. 55 (23)	17.8	18.5	+ 0.7
JHS 263 (23)	32.5	42.3	+ 9.8
I.S. 271 (23)	29.5	38.0	+ 8.5
P.S. 30 (28)	44.7	51.3	+ 6.6
P.S. 80 (28)	48.3	53.6	+ 5.3
JHS 72 (28)	35.2	43.3	+ 8.1
		Average Gain =	+ 5.2%

*Ten percent or more of the students in this school were excused from the test for reasons of limited English speaking proficiency.

For this report, test scores were not available for the mini-school CLC 171, which is located in P.S. 171, or for students in the Alternative School in District 12. Figures for JHS 117 include scores for students in the Career Academy at 117; both schools are involved in the L.S.D.P. Figures for P.S. 108 include scores for all three mini-schools in that building; the three schools are involved in the L.S.D.P.

In several instances the changes are quite large. Between Spring, 1980 and Spring, 1981, most Local School Development schools showed gains in percent of students reading at or above grade level. The average gain for all Local School Development Project schools was 5.2%. Although four schools showed decreases in percent of students reading at or above grade level, the gains for remaining schools ranged from 0.7% to 20.6%. In the previous year, Local School Development Project schools had shown an increase of 9.1% reading at or above grade level. The citywide gain between Spring, 1979 and Spring, 1980 was 6.4%. Also, the two year gain for Local School Development schools was 14.0%, compared to the citywide average of 10.4%.

Many stories could be told of how the planning process resulted in the implementation of programs which had a positive impact on reading improvement. One, in particular, is the story of I.S. 158 in the Bronx. Two important ingredients contributed from the beginning of the project which ultimately contributed to the dramatic gain of 20.6% from 1980 to 1981 in pupils reading at or above grade level. One was the principal and the other, the superintendent. Both individuals are committed, energetic, experimental, interpersonally open individuals who encouraged the development of participative planning through the Local School Development Project.

Several interesting projects grew out of the committee's and principal's work. One was the creation of a school-wide, grade 6 through 8, reading program that is continuous in terms of learning objectives. The implementation of the curriculum was supported by extensive teacher training. Just as SIP found a need to implement continuous reading curricula, so did the Local School Development Project. Directly in support of the reading program another project was implemented to improve teacher expectations of pupil performance. Again, with a similar perspective as SIP, the theory was that if teachers raised their expectations of the student's ability to perform, then student achievement would improve. The teacher expectation project began with teachers filling out a questionnaire for self-analysis followed by a half year of workshops for teachers who identified themselves as having low expectations of their students.

Another project that the school proudly implemented is mainstreaming of one hundred and seventy five special education students into classes with the other four hundred and fifty students in the school. The principal feels that education has improved for all and class size has been reduced, as well. In the spirit of the Local School Development Project, the school is creating an integrated community.

In addition to the in-school activities, the Local School Development Project has sponsored a number of other undertakings. The participating superintendents have been guests at conferences at such places as the Harvard University Graduate School of Education and the Atlanta, Georgia School System. The principals have participated in intensive management training for educational leaders. The internal committee coordinators and members have received training in communications and planning techniques. In addition to the practical information to be learned from such activities, the administrators of the Project feel that the special events generate enthusiasm among the participant school leaders by demonstrating respect for them as professionals and individuals.

Beyond individual schools, Local School Development Project is having an impact on some community district central offices. Just as the project views the individual school holistically, at least one of the superintendents is reorganizing his central office staff along a similar philosophy. Instead of having different specialists from his office focus on separate areas within each building, he is developing a team approach, so that his curriculum, guidance and administration experts analyze a school's needs in total and attempt to integrate the support which they bring to the schools.

The Comprehensive Planning Unit

Federal and State financial aid to public education has been significant in targeting children from lower socio-economic groups for special assistance. National evaluations have demonstrated that programs such as Title I are effective in providing remediation and instructional enrichment for children from economically disadvantaged families. These children's achievement levels have risen as a consequence.

Coupled with the general efficacy of the Title I funded programs* has been a widespread problem with the manner in which these programs have been implemented in individual schools. Analyses by the Office of Funded Programs in New York City found that principals often have provided Title I remediation classes in addition to the regular subject classes without coordination. The effect, for example, has been that a student would study reading in the regular class for several periods a week and in addition would study remedial reading with a different teacher for several periods a week, and the two curricula would be discontinuous or unnecessarily redundant. The regular and remedial teachers would not consult on the needs of the individual students and would not coordinate the curricula so that the remediation directly supported the regular instruction. In too many cases, the uncoordinated assistance has been counter-productive. The full potential for progress through Federal and State assistance has been impaired.

*Programs in local public schools which are subsidized by the federal (and state) governments are called "funded programs".

In an effort to rectify this problem, the Office of Funded Programs has organized and funded through competitive State monies the Comprehensive Planning Unit (CPU). Three staff members work with eight schools in organizing school based planning committees according to the precepts of organization development in schools. The committees are representative of the school's constituencies and the principal is looked to as the key to planning and implementation. The major difference between the approach of CPU and fundamental OD approaches is that CPU has as its focus the reduction of instructional fragmentation due to the lack of coordination between funded programs and regular (i.e. tax levy) programs in a school. The three CPU staff members assist the committees in the development and implementation of comprehensive plans based on detailed needs assessments.

Another important goal of CPU is to assist schools in maximizing shrinking resources, without external assistance. The CPU staff spend considerably less time in schools than the staff of SIP or Local School Development project. The CPU staff is in a participating school only once a month, as opposed to once or twice a week. In lieu of staff time, CPU has researched and written three major publications to assist schools with comprehensive planning: "Comprehensive Planning for Program Coordination"; "Helping Schools Work: Comprehensive Planning Models"; "A Handbook on Comprehensive Planning: Process and Product". Another difference between CPU and most of the other school-based planning projects is that it provides no money for materials or curriculum development. The schools are taught to plan on their own with available resources.

To date it is too soon to report on the degree to which plans are being implemented. Committees do exist in each of the participating schools and meet monthly with the assistance of CPU staff. The schools have also written detailed comprehensive plans.

Targeted High Schools

Deputy Chancellor Richard Halverson, the head of operations for the New York City School system and Executive Director of High Schools, Nathan Quinones, developed a program which identified for improvement 12 high schools which showed low achievement levels, high dropout rates and generally poor images. The initial approach chosen was the development of vocational programs on the assumption that students who are comtemplating dropping out of high schools will more likely complete their high school education if their learning is directly tied to employable skills. Without vocational training many of the students in these schools drop out without marketable skills, get menial jobs, go on welfare or get involved in crime. The goal of the program is to catalyze change in the schools, improve the overall instructional program and raise the school image.

In the participating schools, 18 vocational programs were targeted for enrichment and 10 vocational programs were created anew. Approximately $500,000 of Vocational Education Act money was sought and awarded to the project during spring, 1980. The money was earmarked for new equipment and building renovations.

In addition, the High School Division allocated tax levy monies for instructional supplies, curriculum development, public relations, computerized attendance support, additional security guards, planning coordinators and psychologists, social workers and educational evaluators.

The concept of local school planning enters the picture in the design of the implementation of these programs and resources. Within the procedures of the High School Division's Management by Objectives system, each of the Targeted High Schools submits a detailed plan for its special programs to the Superintendent. The planning coordinator reports to the principal and assists in the development and implementation of plans.

At least two schools are noteworthy of the manner in which they have availed themselves of the additional resources: DeWitt Clinton and Samuel Gompers High Schools, both in the Bronx. The principal of Clinton, David Fuchs, has created a series of ten Career Schools involving a total of 830 students. Four of the programs are the direct result of the infusion of Vocational Education Act Assistance. Comparative statistics show that the dropout rate in the school at large is 22% while in the programs it is only 10%; and the attendance for the first three months of the 81-82 school year in the school at large was between 67% and 70% while in the programs it was between 76% and 78%.

In Gompers High School, the principal, Victor Herbert, has developed four vocational programs with the VEA assistance in Business Machines Repair, General Contracting, Biomedical Electronics and Power Technology, involving several hundred students. The Executive Director of High Schools reports that the process of implementation of these programs has been most effective and the overall school tone has improved significantly as observed by high quality of instruction throughout the school, positive attitudes of staff and students, and a generally improved atmosphere in classrooms and halls conducive to learning.

The Targeted High Schools program represents a merger among the strategies of school based planning, techno-structural change through a top-down approach and effective leadership from the principal to plan and implement change.

Schoolwide Projects

Schoolwide Projects was authorized by the 1978 amendments to ESEA, Title I legislation. If certain requirements are met, it may be implemented in Title I schools in which at least 75% of the enrolled children are from low income families. New York City currently has six participating schoolwide project schools.

A Schoolwide Project is designed to upgrade the entire educational program in the school. A Schoolwide Project which is approved by the State and local officials is granted an exemption from certain statutory and regulatory restraints, both fiscal and programmatic, which permit the expenditure of Title I funds in a more flexible manner than is authorized by law for other Title I projects. Rather than restricting Title I funds to selected Title I eligible students in the school, the Title I funds may be used to include all the students enrolled in the school in a specifically designed instructional program responsive to the special needs of the students. The services provided by Title I need not supplement the services provided by state and local funds. The funds may be blended to fiscally support a comprehensive instructional program.

Schools which enroll a very high number of children from low income families usually include a high density of educationally deprived children. These schools often receive a significant level of Title I funds as well as funds from other sources. Since most students enrolled in the school meet Title I as well as other funding program eligibility criteria, the majority of students participate in one or more funded programs. Scheduling a majority of students for participation in funded programs, each with its own battery of prescriptive regulations and guidelines, is frequently a task which produces an erratic and fragmented educational program for both program participants and other children. Frequent changes in classroom activities reduce both the level and intensity of instruction provided by the classroom teacher. Time on task, which educational research continuously identifies as a critical element of the learning process, is abruptly interrupted by the departure from the classroom of children scheduled for out of class special instruction.

A School-wide Project school must develop a plan which provides for a comprehensive assessment of the educational needs of all students in the school, in particular the special needs of educationally deprived children, and an instructional program designed to meet the special needs of all students in the school. Furthermore, the plan has been developed with the involvement of those individuals who will be engaged in carrying out the plan, including parents, teachers, teacher aides, administrators, and secondary students if the plan relates to a secondary school.

The plan must also include procedures for evaluation and opportunities for periodic improvements in the plan based on the results of those evaluations.

P.S. 27, located in the Red Hook section of community school district 15 in Brooklyn, was the first Schoolwide Project to be implemented in New York City. Following consultation with community school district administrators, Central Board of Education personnel and staff of the State Education Department, the school's Plan, developed by the appropriate and required representatives of the School and Community was approved prior to the start of the 1980-1981 school year.

On-site observations by professional staff of the local school district, State Education Department and Federal Education Department during the school year indicated favorable reviews of the organization and implementation of the Schoolwide Project.

Reading tests results demonstrated that while in 1980 26.9% of the students scored at or above grade level, 33.2% of the students involved in the program scored at or above grade level on the California Achievement Tests administered in the Spring of 1981.

The continued use of the Schoolwide Projects is, at this time, uncertain because of changes made in Title I legislation by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. Specific authority to implement Schoolwide Projects was annulled and the new statute is unclear whether such projects are approvable.

For school year 1981-1982 five additional Schoolwide Projects received approval. One of the projects is in Community School District 1 located on the lower east side of Manhattan. Four Schoolwide Projects are located in Community School District 12 which includes part of the South Bronx.

REQUIREMENTS FOR CREATING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

In those cases when the seven school-based planning projects have contributed toward creating more effective schools they have demonstrated certain common effective practices. They all have either shown or point in the direction of showing that school based planning results in improved pupil achievement and attendance. Positive results are most prevalent when the focus of planning is on the creation of educational programs which address pupil needs not adequately served before. Improvements are most effective when planning is carried out in an efficient and timely manner with the principal actively supporting and managing the implementation of the planned programs. The following six requirement address these issues: organizational self-reflection; planning measureable improvements in pupil outcomes; dynamic, continuous instructional program development; effective planning; the principal as educational leader and organizational manager; central office leadership.

Organizational Self-reflection

To address pupil needs not previously served, the school and the school system must be self-reflective. All of these programs demonstrate the fruitfulness of educational leaders on all levels, from the school to the central office, being self-reflective by seeking answers in systematic ways to the fundamental question, "what are the educational needs of our students and what programs of instruction and curriculum must we create to better serve those needs?" In a large urban setting such as New York City the needs are incredibly diverse considering the linguistic, cultural, economic and individual differences among its students.

The seven school-based planning projects manifest a range of practices of organizational self-reflection. Their variety highlights the fact that there is no one "correct" practice. The High School Division's MBO system is based on an annual school profile of hard data. Each principal is given the profile for his or her own school for the purpose of writing a plan based on the pupil achievement and attendance data contained therein. The process of self-reflection is not restricted to the hard data alone. The principal's observations and experience are important ingredients to the needs assessment, as are the views of key staff in the building and the views of the principal's supervisor, the borough superintendent. The superintendent must approve the plan and the goals for the entire High School Division must be reflected in the school's plan.

In the Schoolwide Projects and the Comprehensive Planning Unit the distinctive practice of self-reflection is that both select only those schools that suffer from fragmentation of funded programs and tax levy programs. This focus guides the needs assessment activities that are conducted in the schools with participative committees. Without being so guided, the school people would probably not focus on the structural problem. Fragmentation of delivery of instructional services has been endemic to their schools since the late 1960's when federal money for remediation of economically disadvantaged children became available through programs such as Title I.

Another self-reflective method which gives its participating schools a focus is found in the Targeted High Schools Project, through its emphasis on vocational training. This approach has two levels of self-reflection. The central administrators determine which schools are in need of assistance and what kind of assistance is called for, namely vocational training. The schools determine what kind of vocational training it needs and how to implement the program.

The program which gives its participating schools the most comprehensive direction for self-reflection is the School Improvement Project. It begins with the proposition that Edmonds' five factors characterize an effective school. Improvement then must begin with a careful assessment of a school's performance in each of the five areas. The principal of the participating school commits to engage in that structured needs assessment. Trained central office consultants, known as liaisons, actually carry out the needs assessment. They interview staff, students and community members, analyze attendance and achievement data and write the assessment. The principal and the school planning committee approve the assessment.

Less direction for self-reflection is given participating schools by the Local School Development Project. It has taken the more classical OD point of view that the school must develop its own self-reflective mechanisms through participative planning representing all constituencies. The project has begun to focus self-reflection in the schools over the past two years by evolving a policy of helping schools improve achievement of their students. Yet, it still remains less directive than the School Improvement Project in pursuing this goal.

An intriguing new technique for organizational self-reflection is being developed in some Local School Development Project schools which relies more on organizational myths and symbols than on standard indices of school effectiveness. The symbolic approach does not seek hard data, but rather seeks "stories" which organizational members have about their organization.

The symbolic perspective draws from a variety of perspectives including symbolic interaction, religion and anthropology, among others.

The methodology being used to employ the symbolic perspective is the "collective school story." With the assistance of facilitators the school committee is guided through a process whereby each member recounts his or her own story in the school.

The collective experiences and emotions are synthesized and commonalities and differences highlighted. Within about a month of the story telling process the collective school community history is generated and presented back to the school. The discussion which follows becomes the basis for the plan to build upon strengths and rectify weaknesses. The early experiments with this method are reported to be promising. In line with the overall mission of the Local School Development Project, the story telling approach to self-reflection helps create a sense of community and positive sense of accomplishment among its participants.

The last of the seven school-based planning projects to comment upon in terms of its approach to self-reflection is Renewal. As the "grandfather" of all the projects it had the least developed approach to self-reflection. It relied solely on attitudinal surveys of staff and students and gave full autonomy to the planning committee to define questions for self-reflection. Consequently, the plan usually lacked the scope of the plans developed in the other school-based planning projects with a more directed approach to self-reflection. This is a significant reason why Renewal did not make more dramatic progress in improving schools.

All of the seven school-based planning projects individually and collectively, demonstrate that the process of self-reflection in a school and in a school system is a requirement for creating effective schools. The concept of self-reflection is relatively new to schools and school systems. The field of OD in schools has emphasized the point for the past twenty years, but only in the past few years, as accountability of schools has been a subject of much public debate, have schools and school systems increasingly sought mechanisms of self-reflection. Local school planning committees, central office analyses of school system trends in achievement, attendance and demographics, and computerized management information systems are all examples of the increasing attention toward organizational self-reflection in school systems. The behavioral science view that dynamic organizations in turbulent times must be self-reflective in order to adjust to new needs and demands is taking hold in public education.

Planning Measurable Improvements in Pupil Outcomes

Creating effective schools requires defining effectiveness in terms of measureable improvements in pupil outcomes. The experience of the seven school-based planning projects, demonstrates that attempts to improve pupil achievement in

measurable ways can work. This has been particularly demonstrated in SIP and LSD for which achievement data are available. As we discussed in the Introduction, above, this goal represents a new consciousness in public education.

Dynamic, Continuous Instructional Program Development

Creating effective schools requires periodic stimulation of program development within the school which meets those student needs which were previously unmet or poorly met. A school, to be effective, is an unending work of art in progress. In the face of continuous change, programs which don't work must be sloughed off and new programs to address new pupil needs must be developed. The growing body of knowledge must be taught as changes in staff and school population occur along with changes in society's values.

The seven school-based planning projects are most successful when their participating schools manifest a virtual renaissance in program development which affects the majority, if not all, of the students and staff in a building. Schools such as PS 158 in Local School Development, PS 155 in School Improvement, Monroe High School in Renewal, PS 27 in Schoolwide Projects, Clinton and Gompers in Targeted High Schools,

and so on, all manifest intelligent, prolific instructional program development. Consequently, staff and student morale improve, program implementation is further facilitated, pride in the school grows and, in some cases, pupil achievement improves. The new instructional programs become symbols of hope and promise for the future of the students.

Effective Planning

All of the school-based projects demonstrate a commitment to effective techniques of planning within the building. Diagnosis of priority student needs through organizational self-reflection and a focus on measurably improving pupil achievement through program development are not sufficient, in themselves, to bring about significant school improvement. The technology of writing effective plans is also important. The major requirements of planning are as follows: addressing significant needs among the students; specifying program requirements for implementation; and the total understanding and active support of the plan by the principal.

Another criterion of effective planning is the participation of constituencies in planning. Most of the school-based planning projects make a significant effort at including as many constituencies as possible in planning, including the development of a representative planning team. The theory is that if those who are responsible for implementation are involved in the planning then their commitment to implementation will be stronger, based on their ownership of the plans. The School Improvement Project,

Local School Development Project, Renewal and CPU have the most explicit methods for developing participation in planning through constituency based planning committees. The key to effective use of participation is the principal.

Participation requires leadership, direction and coordination, otherwise it becomes anarchic. Participation has its potential costs. Planning with representative groups is time consuming and plans may become trivialized in the process of seeking compromise among potentially antagonistic constituencies. For these reasons some projects do not emphasize participative planning committees. Among these, still there are examples of effective planning and productive program implementation. The two Targeted High Schools, Clinton and Gompers, both have demonstrated success and largely through the efforts of their principals. Consultants are periodically involved in the planning or implementation of individual projects without a central planning committee. Apparently, whether the primary vehicle for planning is a representative committee or the principal alone, it is less important than whether the plans speak well to the priority needs of the students and the principal actively seeks to implement them.

The Principal as Educational Leader and Organizational Manager

All of the school-based planning projects also express a belief in and demonstrate the importance of the role of principal as educational leader and organizational manager. Effective implementation of planned programs depends heavily on the support and coordination of the principal. The principal, who has the authority of deciding on potentially competing objectives, allocation of resources and the authority of holding staff accountable, is the most important individual in the picture of school-based planning.

The schools which are mentioned above as being particularly successful with school-based planning techniques all have principals who evidence educational leadership. This leadership is demonstrated in advocating and supporting the development of instructional programs which serve priority needs of their students. In some cases, the ideas for programs originated with them, in many cases with others. The principal plays the key role in stimulating ideas for program development and in recognizing those ideas which merit the most support.

The SIP principals are a good example. The idea for a continuous reading curriculum through all grades in a building did not originate with them and still, they siezed on it, learned what it entailed and supported its full implementation. The payoff was significant improvement in reading scores. The principals of the successful school-based planning schools also evidence the skills

of the organizational manager. The principal of Clinton H.S., for example, is carefully managing the restructuring of his 3,000 student school into small organizational units ("mini-schools"). His purpose is in providing increased choices for his students in selecting a vocational area in which to concentrate. The managerial challenge is considerable with such a major reorganization. Program development, staffing, scheduling, budgeting and mollifying internal political squabbles are all complex activities.

A principal needs a wide array of educational and organizational skills and knowledge in order to run an effective school. Management training is now being offered principals to assist them in honing and expanding their skills. The Local School Development Project and the High School Division independently offer training which complement their respective planning programs. The curriculum is both educational and organizational. Educational topics include "a school-wide reading approach", "Mastery Learning, individualized instruction within a regular classroom", and others. Organizational management topics include time management, running meetings, planning, controlling, delegating and others. The training proves most effective when it is linked to the in-school planning and program development activities with which the principals are engaged.

SCHOOL-BASED PLANNING PROJECTS

AND

CENTRAL OFFICE LEADERSHIP

	Sponsoring Office	Voluntary of Mandatory	Goals	Technical Assistance	Accountability To Central Office
High School Division MBO	Executive Director High Schools	Mandatory	Major ones set by Executive Director	Consultants in borough Superintendents' offices	Principals to borough Superintendents, Executive Director and Deputy Chancellor
School Improvment Project	Deputy Chancellor for Instruction	Voluntary	Edmonds' five factors and measurable improvement in achievement	Consultants from Project office	Informal
Local School Development Project	District Superintendent	Voluntary	Measureable improvement in achievment	Consultants from Project office with consultants from District Superintendent's office	District Superintendent
Schoolwide Projects	Office of Funded Programs (Chancellor's Office)	Voluntary	Reduce fragmentation, tax levy and funded programs	Advice from Office of Funded Programs	Informal
Renewal Project	Borough Superintendent	Voluntary	School determined	Same MBO consultants	Informal
Comprehensive Planning Unit	Office of Funded Programs (Chancellor's Office)	Voluntary	Coordinate and reduce, fragmentation, tax levy and funded programs	Consultants from Project Office	Informal
Targeted High Schools	Executive Director of High Schools	Mandatory	Establish vocational programs as catalyst for total school improvement	Advice from MBO consultants	Borough Superintendents, Executive Director and Deputy Chancellor

Central Office Leadership

The school-based planning projects demonstrate that central office* leadership is a fundamental requirement for creating effective schools. Without that direction school-based planning can wander aimlessly into inconsequential areas without significantly helping children. The significance of central office leadership begins with the climate for change that is established. The current Chancellor's philosophy for change pervades the school system. Change for the sake of educational improvement is becoming an accepted norm. In terms of the school-based planning projects, central office leadership may be defined in terms of five dimensions. Which central office sponsors the project? Does the central office make the project voluntary or mandatory? Does the project have clear goals for school improvement which are sanctioned by the sponsoring office? Does the central office provide technical assistance to the participating schools? Does the central office hold the participating principals accountable for improving their schools in the projects?

The critical question is which of these dimensions is most significant in contributing to the improvement of a school? To assist in answering that question the following chart summarizes the seven school-based planning projects in terms of the five dimensions.

*The term "central office" means different things in New York City since the lower schools, k-9, are decentralized into thirty-two semi-autonomous community districts, each with its own superintendent and community school board. The high schools are centralized under an Executive Director who reports to the Chancellor. The rules and regulations and budgeting for the school system are established by the Chancellor for all schools including those in the semi-autonomous districts and the centralized high schools.

The experience with the seven school-based planning projects suggests that the two most important central office leadership dimensions which contribute to improving schools are that the sponsoring office be sufficiently high in authority, that is, part of the policy developing machinery of the school system and that the goals for the project are clear and sensibly contribute to improving education in the building. The combination of the two result in participants in the project schools clearly knowing what is expected of them from their superiors. The Renewal Project serves to make this point as the counter example, in contrast to the other projects. Renewal is supported by High School Division Borough Superintendents with marginal planning funds and marginal consulting assistance and it represents no set of goals for improving a school other than advocating processes of organizational self-reflection. Renewal tends not to result in as high a rate of instructional program development and implementation in its participating schools as do the other school-based planning projects.

The other central office leadership dimensions are less consistently related to the rate of instructional program development and implementation. In the Voluntary/Mandatory dimension there are positive examples of program implementation among both voluntary and mandatory school participants. Similarly, in the technical assistance dimension, there are examples of progress among schools with planning with much and with little technical assistance. Finally, there are examples of schools which make progress with planning under conditions of strong accountability and weak accountability.

Technical assistance and structures of accountability prove to be most productive with principals who are still inexperienced. Mandatory approaches prove to be most productive in implementing procedures and programs that central leadership has determined are essential based on organizational self-reflection carried out on that level. For this reason MBO is mandatory. The Executive Director of High Schools determined that systematic, annual planning based on an assessment of the individual's schools progress is essential. Implementation of MBO has succeeded over three years because of the seriousness of follow-up accountability procedures instituted by the Executive Director. Voluntary approaches, as seen in most of the other projects, are most productive with schools which are "ready" for patricipative planning and program development.

The experience of the school-based planning projects supports the notion that central office leadership is a requirement for creating effective schools through the control of standards, expectations and resources. Central offices alert principals and other school personnel as to the programmatic priorities for their schools. Those priorities are underscored by the resources made available to the schools in the form of technical assistance from the projects and in some cases, real dollars for program development. As evidenced by the school-based planning projects, when the standards and expectations are sensible, the schools respond favorably.

PROMINENT SCHOOL-BASED PLANNING ISSUES

The literature on OD in schools and the experience of the seven school-based planning projects which are reported on here, highlight the importance of several issues beyond the requirements for effective school-based planning just discussed. How is the "readiness" of a school for systematic, self-reflective planning a factor in the success of the school with such a project? How is the manner in which the project is begun and organized in the school a factor in the success of the school with the project? How can the paradoxical opposing forces of bottom-up planning and top-down direction be creatively and productively reconciled? How essential are change agent specialists with roles defined as directly supporting and or leading the planning effort? Finally, what role do political conflicts, alliances and negotiations play in the process of improving a school, particularly in the turbulent environment of urban school districts?

Readiness for School-based Planning

Fullan, Miles and Taylor (1981) address the question of "readiness conditions and OD's appropriateness for public service agencies such as schools." They conclude that "classical OD

(organizational process and problem oriented approaches) seem to depend on fairly stable environmental conditions, and a certain level of favorable attitude and initial propensity for collective problem solving. Thus, this form of OD probably does not represent the most appropriate strategy for change in turbulent urban school districts."

The experience of the seven school-based planning projects in New York City both disconfirms and confirms this conclusion. The disconfirmation is manifested by several of the projects which have voluntary methods of involvement designed to attract schools which are in need of improvement and which meet the criterion of the "initial propensity for collective problem solving". In a large urban school district, such as New York City, a proportion of the schools fall into this category, even though the general environment is turbulent and probably not conducive to classical OD. These schools are usually characterized by a principal who is tremendously motivated to improve his or her school, who has been searching for new techniques to energize and involve staff and students, and simply has not known how to go about it. This principal has felt that he or she has accomplished a lot in the school, there is still much more to accomplish and over the past few years progress has plateaued. School-based planning has helped such a principal to infuse renewed energy into the school and to stimulate new program development.

The confirmation for Fullan's et al's conclusion is manifested by the urban schools which are not "ready" for OD and still are in need of improvement. Mandatory methods are necessary for these schools. For example, the High School Division's MBO system is based on the assumption that while collective problem solving is organizationally healthy, not many schools are ready for it. The next best thing to collective approaches is routine problem-solving and systematic planning carried out by the principal. Hence, MBO mandates that every administrator regularly plan activities within his or her scope of authority, collectively or not.

The Targeted High Schools is another example of the necessity for mandatory methods for schools in need of improvement which may not be ready for OD. The central office has selected the schools in dire need of assistance and has given direction and resources while leaving leeway for the schools to mold the direction of their program planning. A classical OD approach in schools with such severe needs is probably inappropriate. An organization which may be struggling for its very existence probably does not have the substantive, psychic and emotional resources to solve its own problems.

An interesting postscript on the Renewal Project, along these lines, concerns an extremely troubled school which participated in Renewal under a principal who cared deeply and tried hard to improve his school. The pathology of the school was so chronic

however, that Renewal failed. The attendance rate, dropout rate, declining enrollment rate and achievement rates were among the poorest of all the high schools in the city and did not improve. Mandatory planning through MBO did not help, nor did participation in the Targeted Schools Project. A strategy finally was arrived at which offers the most promise -- a complete structural change. A coalition of a variety of educational agencies was formed to change the number of grades and the complete instructional program in the building. The staff will be reassigned and new staff including a new principal will be brought in. Immediate projections are for an increase in enrollment and a new sense of hope in the school on the part of the community. The meaning of this promising story is that when readiness for school-based planning is not found and may not be possible to generate, top down structural change with a change of leadership probably is the most sensible approach.

Organizing The Beginning: Entry

Regardless of whether or not a school based planning project is voluntary or mandatory, or whether or not a school is "ready" for OD, the later success of the project is heavily dependent on how the beginning was organized. In the OD literature, organizing the beginning is known as 'entry'. The numerous successful examples of school based planning efforts in various schools within the seven school-based planning projects may all be traced to careful and proper attention to the fundamental activities of entry.

The first activity involving the schools is selection. Whether or not the project is voluntary or mandatory, the selection of schools must be fair and sensible. That is, the schools must indeed be in need of assistance and they must not be stigmatized by being selected. A part of the selection process includes introductory orientation.

After a school has been selected, the next entry activity is thorough orientation. The principal and key members of the school must be given a thorough presentation of the purposes and methods of the project and the probable duration for accomplishing school improvement. Short term improvements may be seen within six months or less and longer term, durable improvements which relate to improved achievement scores, usually take at least one to two years. The orientation also includes an outline of how the school can organize its planning committee. The principal must approach

committee formation with similar issues in mind which informed the selection of his or her school. Membership should be fair and sensible. It may be voluntary, mandatory or some mix which may be dubbed "benign persuasion" by the principal. The key constituencies should be represented and the possibility of groups or individuals feeling disenfranchised should be minimized.

Related to orientation, the next entry activity is training of the principal and the committee in the art and science of planning and implementation. The overall model of planning is explored including the usual steps of needs assessment, plan development, implementation and evaluation. Skills is running meetings are also a prominent training topic. The end product of effective entry activities is the creation of a motivated planning team, including the principal, which has reasonable expectations as to the goals and the time frame.

Another entry technique, effectively employed by Renewal and the Local School Development Project, is helping the committee create an "early, yet moderate success". Within a month or two, if the committee is successful in creating even a modest improvement in the school, its self-confidence will begin to develop. Building self-confidence in the committee is essential since many school people enter planning activities with great trepidation. Over the years many projects have been begun in urban schools with much fanfare and little success. School people will begin to lose interest as they remember past failures unless they feel the experience of progress relatively quickly, within a

few months. For all of the above reasons, the activities of entry are essential to the later success of school-based planning activities.

Top-down vs. Bottom-up Approaches To Planning

A paradox of school-based planning is that all of the projects, to a greater or lesser degree, manifest both top-down direction and bottom-up participation in plans to improve schools. During the first two years of the mandatory implementation of MBO, for example, several principals complained that participative planning could not be mandated. The contradiction compromised participation. They went further and explained that they felt hamstrung in their planning by the goals imposed on them by the Executive Director of High Schools. How could they plan uniquely for their individual schools if they were given goals by their director? By year three, the criticism quieted and the resolution to the paradox began to gain acceptance: the goals are broad, based on High School Division-wide strategic planning and within those goals a principal has considerable flexibility and latitude. Further, the mandate to plan in a participative fashion is simply a mandate to the principal to consult with constituencies within the building. The logic of planning and consultation within MBO is no longer vociferously disputed.

The Targeted School Project also manifests the paradox of top-down direction and bottom-up planning. The participating schools are told to plan occupational education programs and they are given the resources to do so. How they do it and in which area are their decisions.

One of the frustrations with school based planning as a bottom-up process is the feeling among some administrators that it takes too long to work. Their inclination is toward the side of benevolent despotism. That approach can also work. Depending on the readiness of the school for participative, bottom-up approaches, a balance of top-down and bottom-up planning processes is desirable.

Leadership

How the administrators handle both bottom-up and top-down approaches to planning is related to their leadership style. The complete leader, as seen in the most effective principals and superintendents who participate in the seven school-based planning projects, combine top-down direction with bottom-up consultation. They know what they want educationally and know how to organize participation when appropriate.

All of the success stories among the school-based planning projects come back to the important leadership role the principal plays. In some schools the principal already had a good track record as a leader who employed the school-based planning techniques to stimulate new program development. In other successful schools the principal learned more about what he or she wanted educationally, communicated that to the school and learned more about how to organize participation and consultation in planning.

The systematic nature of the school-based planning projects has assisted principals in improving their leadership skills. The bottom line of effective leadership is the same as the bottom line of the school based planning projects: program development for improved pupil achievement.

The Change Agent

The key role in the process of improving a school is the change agent. In the school-based planning projects the change agent is either the principal, an external consultant or an internal coordinator, or any combination or permutation of the three. The change agent is the organizer, trainer, transmitter and leader of the process of planning and implementation. While the external change agent can be effective and influencial, the internal change agent --be it the principal or internal coordinator --has the potential of being more influencial. The internal change agent is in the school full-time and already enjoys being a part of a network of relationships.

The seven school-based planning projects demonstrate that change agents can be effective by having process and or content skills. The process skills are those of the OD consultant, such as organizing and managing group behavior, conflict management, planning, time management, core management skills, ets. The content skills are those of the educator. The School Improvement Project, in particular, has shown that its consultants (liaisons) are most effective because they combine both skill areas.

The more effective principals in the school based planning projects also have demonstrated ability in both the process and the content skills areas. This finding coincides with the Edmonds factors which holds that the effective urban school has a principal who is both an educational leader and an organizational manager.

The Politics of Improving an Urban School

A school, particularly an urban school, is subject to a variety of political pressures. The constituencies within the building apply pressure to one another and the central office and the schools also apply pressures to one another. Finally, the various community interest groups apply pressure to the school and the school system. Politics in this case should be interpreted to mean the dynamics of power relationships, as individuals and organizational sub-systems attempt to preserve or further their influence within the organizational system.

The process of school-based planning results in the creation of a new interest group: the planning committee. This group exercises new pressures on the other organizational sub-systems of the school to effect change. In some cases, the planning committee becomes a nucleus for galvanizing the larger school community. The Local School Development Project, in particular, makes a concerted effort to involve large numbers of members of the school community. In so doing, the political relationships of the sub-groups are transformed. Whereas previously, parents may have felt disenfranchised and apathetic, with effective techniques of involvement, parents become part of the cooperative venture.

With effective school-based planning, the teachers' union, too, becomes a part of the cooperative venture for improving the school and does not see its role exclusively as the agent representing teachers to protect the rank and file. The examples of effective school-based planning all are manifestations of a change in political relationships from win-lose dynamics to win-win dynamics.

The possibilities for cooperation among different interest groups in the school community is a function not only of improved expertise in the field of school-based planning but also of the times in which we live. At least in New York City, cooperation among unions, management and the community groups is at an all time high. The conflicts of the sixties and the seventies are behind us, at least for the time being. The school system is partially decentralized and still the union feels strong. Power among all constituencies has increased. As the theory of organizational development holds, power in an organization is not a finite entity that interest groups must fight over. Cooperation and the creation of positive results, in turn, permit everyone's power in the system to increase.

The same phenomenon is true of the relationship of the central office to the individual school. When the Chancellor or a District Superintendent exercise leadership and give direction to the school system or an individual school, his or her power increases when the direction produces results. And when results are seen, the power of the individual school also increases.

There is nothing surprising in this course of events. A school is a human system and is part of a larger human system, the school system. Organizational theory and research has persuasively demonstrated that the sub-systems of a human system are interdependent. Pathology in a human system affects all sub-systems. Recovery and health, similarly, affect all sub-systems. The exercise of cooperative power is a sign of organizational health. The positive results of the seven school-based planning projects are an important sign of the organizational health of the school system and its political transformation over recent years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fullan, Michael; Miles, Matthew; Taylor, Gibb; Organization Development in Schools: The State of the Art. February 1981 National Institute of Education

Gray, Lynn; Deal, Terry; Stories As A Strategy For Improving Urban Schools; Paper to be presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting; New York City, March 1982

Gross, Thomas and Bassin, Marc; Organization Development: A Viable Method of Change for Urban Secondary Schools; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting; Toronto, 1978

McCarthy, Dennis; Guttenberg, Richard; Canner, Jane; Chawla, Louise; Lazarus, Alan; Local School Development Project: The First Annual Assessment Report; October 1980

McCarthy, Dennis; Guttenberg, Richard; Canner, Jane; Chawla, Louise; Lazarus, Alan; School Improvement Project: The Second Annual Assessment Report; Unpublished report; MEDARP Documentation Unit; New York City Public Schools; August, 1981

Schmuck, Richard, Runkel, Phil, Arends, J. and Arends, R.; The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools; Palo Alto, Calif., Mayfield Publishing, 1977

Troiano, Vincent; Formative Evaluation Report on the Board of Education Twelve High School Program Office of the Deputy Chancellor; Economic Development Council of NYC; unpublished; September, 1981